

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 24-26, and 32 have been amended. Claims 11-23 have been indicated as allowable. Claims 5-10 have been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1-33 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 1-3, 26-28, and 32-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 99/36795 to Krasner (“Krasner”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,375 to Parmentier (“Parmentier”). Claims 1, 26, and 32, as amended, recite in part that the “signal quality of the input signals is maintained in the presence of the output signals.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Parmentier does not teach or suggest that signal quality of the input signals is maintained in the presence of output signals. “[T]he receiver may operate in a *reduced capacity* due to periodic desensitization...” (emphasis added). See Parmentier col. 2, lines 48-51. As such, the system of Parmentier remains operational, but at reduced performance. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1, 26, and 32 distinguish over the combination of Krasner and Parmentier. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 1, 26, and 32 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 27-28, and 33 are either directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, 26, or 33 and therefore distinguish over the combination of Krasner and Parmentier for at least the same reasons as stated above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 2-3, 27-28 and 33 be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 24-25, and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasner in view of Parmentier and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,427 to Hughes (“Hughes”). Claims 4 and 29-31 are either directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1 or 26 and therefore distinguish over the combination of Krasner and Parmentier for at least the same reasons as stated above. Hughes does not remedy the deficiencies of Krasner and Parmentier noted above. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4 and 29-31 as unpatentable over the combination of Krasner, Parmentier, and Hughes is respectfully requested.

Claims 24 and 25 recite, in part, that the "signal quality of the input signals is maintained in the presence of the output signals." As set forth above, the combination of Krasner and Parmentier does not teach or suggest maintaining the signal quality of the input signals in the presence of the output signals. Hughes does not remedy the deficiencies of Krasner and Parmentier noted above. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 24 and 25 as unpatentable over the combination of Krasner, Parmentier, and Hughes is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: December 24, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Ashley N. Moore

Registration No.: 51,667  
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL  
CORPORATION  
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200  
Dallas, Texas 75202  
(214) 855-4500  
(214) 855-4300 (Fax)